

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on June 9, 2009, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6 and 8-11 are pending in this application, where claim 5 has been currently canceled, and claims 10-11 have been currently added. Claims 1, 6 and 8 are independent.

In the Office Action, the specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. §132(a). Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that no new matter had been added to the specification. However, in the interest of advancing consideration and allowance of the present application and to reduce issues should an appeal be necessary, the specification is amended herein. It is respectfully submitted that the objection to the specification under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) is overcome.

In the Office Action, claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the

written description requirement. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the Application fully complies with the enablement requirement. However, in the interest of advancing consideration and allowance of the present application and to reduce issues should an appeal be necessary, claim 6 is amended herein. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is overcome.

In the Office Action, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,741,617 (Rosengren) in view of U.S. Patent No. 2002/0047918 (Sullivan) and ISO/IEC 13818-2: 2000 MPEG Standard (MPEG). Further, claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rosengren, Sullivan and MPEG. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rosengren, Sullivan and MPEG. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rosengren, Sullivan and MPEG. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rosengren, Sullivan and MPEG. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rosengren, Sullivan and MPEG. Applicant respectfully traverses and submits that claims 1, 3-4, 6 and 8-11, as amended, are patentable over Rosengren, Sullivan and MPEG for at

least the following reasons.

Rosengren is directed to an arrangement for deriving an ancillary signal from a compressed digital video signal. As shown in FIG 6, three decoders, namely, audio, video and PIP decoders 61, 62, 63 receive different signals.

Sullivan is directed to a system that identifies video data to be encoded as well as multiple display regions associated with a particular video display type.

It is respectfully submitted that Rosengren, Sullivan, and combination thereof, do not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

first retrieval unit for receiving said digital information signal and retrieving said first video signal from the received digital information signal;
second retrieval unit for receiving said digital information signal and retrieving said second video signal from the received digital information signal;
and ...

the apparatus further comprises third retrieval unit for receiving said digital information signal and retrieving the parameter signal, the signal combination unit overlaying the second video signal on top of the first video signal in dependence on said parameter signal

Three units that receive the same digital information signal and retrieve different portions of this same digital information signal is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Rosengren and Sullivan, alone or in combination. Rather, Rosengren discloses three decoders namely audio, video and PIP decoders 61, 62, 63 that receive different signals.

Further, Rosengren, Sullivan, and combination thereof, do not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 6, which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the digital information signal further comprises a separate playlist consisting of items having a size smaller than the first size for selection of the second video signal by a user.

A record carrier having a digital information signal recorded thereon that comprises a separate playlist consisting of items having a size smaller is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Rosengren and Sullivan, alone or in combination.

In addition, Rosengren, Sullivan, and combination thereof, do not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 8, which, amongst other patentable elements,

recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

control signal for indicating a location where
the second video signal is to be overlaid on top of
the first video signal.

A control signal for indicating a location where the second video signal is to be overlaid on top of the first video signal is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Rosengren and Sullivan, alone or in combination. Rosengren does not even disclose or suggest two different video signals, let alone disclosing or suggesting a control signal for indicating the location where the second video signal is to be overlaid on top of the first video signal. Rather, Rosengren is merely concerned with displaying an image at different display regions of a display. MPEG is cited to allegedly show other features and does not remedy the deficiencies in Rosengren and Sullivan.


Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1, 6 and 8 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-4 and 9-11 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1, 6 and 8 as well as their individually patentable elements.

Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded. And in particular, no Official Notices are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
September 9, 2009

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101

Please direct all inquiries and correspondence to:
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
(914) 333-9643